MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Housing and Community Development Division is to provide Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Program funding to municipalities and other subrecipients not eligible for direct United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) funding so they can develop viable communities and to primarily benefit low and moderate income people.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE REGULAR MEETING MAY 9, 2018

DRAFT MINUTES

MEMBER OR ALTERNATE REPRESENTING

******PRESENT******

Lana Mook	El Mirage	Attended by phone
Brannon Hampton	Goodyear	
Ricardo Vital	Guadalupe	Attended by phone
John Carnero	Tolleson	
Rui Pereira	Wickenburg	
Margaret Chittenden	Youngtown	
Jacki Taylor	District 1	
Bill McAllister	District 2	

Sam Crump District 3 Attended by phone Marshall Hunt District 2

District 5

******ABSENT******

Martin Quezada

Jeanine Guy	Buckeye
Chris Riggs	Gila Bend
Tony Gutowski	District 3
Ed Kientz	District 4
Ira McCullough	District 4
John Gomez	District 5

PUBLIC PRESENT

Jeanne Blackman Judy Johnson Alex Lestinsky Jessica Perry Andrea Marquez

STAFF PRESENT

Rachel Milne Carl Morgan

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Rui Pereira called the meeting to order at approximately 6:35 PM.

2. ROLL CALL AND ESTABLISHMENT OF QUORUM

Carl Morgan took roll call. 9 members were present including 2 members attending by phone. A quorum was established. 2 additional members joined the meeting after roll call was taken, one in person, and one on the phone.

3. MINUTES- APRIL 11, 2018

The minutes were amended to include the public comment made by Jeanne Blackman. John Carnaro moved and Brannon Hampton seconded a motion to approve the amended April 11, 2018 CDAC meeting minutes. The motion was approved unanimously by voice vote.

4. 2019-2020 URBAN COUNTY CDBG FUNDING PRIORITIES and

5. 2019-2020 URBAN COUNTY SCORING SHEET

Carl Morgan briefly summarized the results of the CDAC member voting on the 9 priority areas on the CDAC Prioritization Vote sheet distributed and discussed during the April 11, 2018 CDAC meeting. Copies of the voting results were distributed during the meeting, emailed to the CDAC for members attending on the phone, and was projected on the screen in the meeting room.

CDAC members were asked to vote on the priorities listed below by ranking them from 1 for the highest priority, to 9 for the lowest priority. The CDAC voting resulted in the following ranking of CDAC priorities.

Ranking	<u>Priority</u>	
1	Public Safety Infrastructure Improvements (New street lights, new installation of sidewalks, water line improvement for fire safety)	
2	Public Facilities/Community Centers Focused on Human Service Activities (Housing for homeless, food banks, Boys and Girls Clubs, senior centers, youth centers)	3.4
3	Owner Occupied Housing Rehabilitation	4.2
4	ADA Improvements (Sidewalks, community center)	4.6
5	General Infrastructure Improvements (Street improvements, water line replacement)	
6	Elimination of Slum and Blight (demolishing blighting structures, code compliance)	5.4
7	Economic Development Activities (micro enterprise development, small loan pool)	
8	Fire Protection Equipment (fire truck purchase)	6.6
9	Park Improvements / Installation	6.9

The CDAC accepted the results of the voting and the ranking of priorities as presented above. The CDAC decided to discuss the Funding Priorities agenda item and the next agenda item, the CDBG Scoring Sheet at the same time.

The CDAC proceeded to discuss the priorities, how to revise the scoring sheet to reflect the new CDAC priorities, the Recently Awarded CDBG Funding scoring category, and other areas of interest related to CDBG applications and the allocation / scoring process. Discussion points and comments included:

- The funding priorities category on the scoring sheet is currently worth 15 points. The scoring sheet states that projects that are a priority can get 15 points, 0 points if it isn't. Last year all applications were awarded, on average, between 13 and 14 points.
- Revising the funding priorities category on the scoring sheet was discussed.
 - \circ Award 15 points to projects that are one of the top 3 priorities, 10 points for priorities 4 6, and 5 points for priorities 7 9.
 - Look at reducing the amount of points assigned to funding priorities by shifting some points to other categories.
 - Award 9 points to projects that are the highest priority, 8 points to the 2nd highest, and on to 1 point to projects that are the 9th priority.
 - \circ Award 9 points to project that are one of the top 3 priorities, 6 points for priorities 4-6, and 3 points to priorities 7-9.
- The average scores CDAC members gave to the 2018-19 applications were in a fairly narrow range. The highest application scored an average of 88.5%, the lowest 81.4%, a 7 point spread.
- There is some interest in having parity across the funding priorities. The priorities for one city aren't the same as a different city.
- CDAC has allocated 15% of the CDBG allocation for homeless services. This is the maximum amount that can be awarded to projects that provide social services such as food banks, homeless shelters, senior centers, etc. The 15% cap is for services only. Funding can be awarded to nonprofits for 'hammer and nail' projects including acquisition, rehabilitation, renovation, or expansion of a facility such as a shelter or food bank where services are provided. These 'hammer and nail' projects aren't subject to the 15% cap.
- Some projects are larger and require funding over more than one year. CDAC members expressed support for considering if a project received partial funding last year.
- Concern was expressed that projects need to move forward in a timely manner. Awarding a large amount of funding to a project that isn't moving forward can put the County at risk of not meeting the annual CDBG spending deadline.
- CDAC members expressed support for increased requirements for a project to get full points in the Past Performance category, and for continued reporting to CDAC on the progress of all active projects.
- CDAC members expressed interest in including a category on the scoring sheet that would award points to a project that was partially funded or is a continuation of a project funded in the previous year.

Following additional discussion, Brannon Hampton moved and John Carnero seconded a motion to make the following changes to the CDAC Scoring sheet, dated 1/10/18:

- 1. Change the Priorities category to award points to projects that are:
 - Public Safety Infrastructure, Public Facilities / Centers focused on human services, and Owner Occupied Rehab (Ranked 1-3) up to 10 points.

- ADA Improvements, General Infrastructure, and Elimination of Slum and Blight (Ranked 4-6) up to 7 points
- Economic Development, Fire Protection Equipment, and Park Improvements (Ranked 7-9) up to 4 points.
- 2. Revise Recently Awarded CDBG Funding by adding: Has not been funded in the past 3 years or is a continuation of a project that was partially funded last year 10 points.

The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

6. STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS

- Urban County Cities and Towns have been asked to provide their CDAC appointment recommendations for next year to the County by May 22, 2018.
- District representatives are encouraged to contact their Supervisor's office if they are interested in serving on CDAC next year.
- The County did make the 1.5 rule expenditure deadline at the end of April. A special thank you goes to the City/Town of Buckeye, El Mirage, and Gila Bend for helping the County make the deadline.
- The County has received the 2018-19 HUD funding allocations. The HOME Consortium allocation for affordable housing received a \$1,500,000 increase, CDBG received a \$200,000 increase, and the Emergency Solutions Program for the homeless received a \$3,000 increase.
- This is expected to be Carl Morgan's last CDAC meeting. He will be retiring this summer.

The June CDAC meeting is expected to be cancelled. If there is a meeting, it will be on Wednesday, June 13, 2018.

7. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

There were no comments from the public.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Having no further business before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:45 PM.